

TAIRA *et al.*, SN 10/670,352
Amdt. dated 05/02/2004
Reply to OA mailed 02/01/2005

Dkt. 501.41197CX1/310100259US2
Page 6

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action identified above, and is further responsive in any other manner indicated below.

PENDING CLAIMS

Claims 1-9 were pending in the application, under consideration and subject to examination at the time of the Office Action. Unrelated to any prior art, scope or rejection, appropriate Claims have been amended, added or deleted (without prejudice or disclaimer) in order to adjust a clarity and/or focus of Applicant's claimed invention. That is, the amendments to the claims are unrelated to any prior art or scope adjustment, and are simply clarified claims in which Applicant is presently interested. At entry of this paper, Claims 1 and 10-18 are now pending in the application for consideration and examination.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS OBVIATED VIA CLAIM CANCELLATION

Claim 9 was objected to because of the Office Action concerns listed in the first half of page 2 of the Office Action. As Claim 9 has been canceled (without prejudice or disclaimer), reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102 - TRAVERSED

All 35 USC §102 rejections are respectfully traversed. Unrelated to any prior art, scope or rejection, Claims 2-9 are cancelled herein (without prejudice or

TAIRA *et al.*, SN 10/670,352
Amdt. dated 05/02/2004
Reply to OA mailed 02/01/2005

Dkt. 501.41197CX1/310100259US2
Page 7

disclaimer), which renders the rejection of such claims and traversal arguments obsolete at this point in time. Based upon the following, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

All descriptions of Applicants disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated herein by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are respectfully strongly traversed.

The requirements to support a rejection under 35 USC §102 as indicated in the decision of *In re Robertson*, 49 USPQ2d 1949 (Fed. Cir. 1999), require that each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. However, the cited prior art does not adequately support either a §102 anticipation-type rejection because it does not, at minimum, disclose (or suggest) the following limitations of Applicant's clarified claims, *i.e.*, utilizing test programs within a wafer prober, and automatically changing a test program from the first test program to the second test program in the prober.

Patentability of the rejected claims and traverse of the rejection are supported by the following remarks from Applicant's foreign representative.

More particularly, the present invention is directed to an IC fabrication method where a wafer prober automatically changes a test program corresponding to a second wafer set in a second cassette after finishing the test of a first wafer set in a first cassette.

TAIRA *et al.*, SN 10/670,352
Amdt. dated 05/02/2004
Reply to OA mailed 02/01/2005

Dkt. 501.41197CX1/310100259US2
Page 8

Anderson (US 5,834,838 A), at Col. 15, line 64-Col. 16, line 12, discloses a die tester or prober, but does not disclose or suggest a wafer prober, and does not disclose or suggest automatically changing a test program corresponding to a second wafer set in a second cassette after finishing the test of a first wafer set in a first cassette.

FIG. 4 of Anderson shows a die mounter which can accommodate a plurality of frame cassettes (a die holding "frame" used after a wafer pelletizing step). However, FIG. 4 of Anderson does not show or suggest a wafer prober, and does not disclose or suggest automatically changing a test program corresponding to a second wafer set in a second cassette after finishing the test of a first wafer set in a first cassette.

Col. 14, lines 12-27 of Anderson discloses a die mounter which can accommodate a plurality of frames. However, this disclosure of Anderson does not teach or suggest a wafer prober, and does not disclose or suggest automatically changing a test program corresponding to a second wafer set in a second cassette after finishing the test of a first wafer set in a first cassette.

Col. 19, lines 35-51 of Anderson discloses a frame cassette handling section (within the die mounter) which can handle a plurality of cassettes. However Anderson does not show or suggest a wafer prober, and does not disclose or suggest automatically changing a test program corresponding to a second wafer set in a second cassette after finishing the test of a first wafer set in a first cassette.

In summary, Anderson teaches a die (not a wafer) mounter with a die tester and a frame (not a wafer) handling apparatus which can handle a plurality of frame

TAIRA *et al.*, SN 10/670,352
Amdt. dated 05/02/2004
Reply to OA mailed 02/01/2005

Dkt. 501.41197CX1/310100259US2
Page 9

cassettes (not wafer cassettes), and more specifically, Anderson does not disclose or suggest automatically changing a test program corresponding to a second wafer set in a second cassette after finishing the test of a first wafer set in a first cassette.

In addition to the foregoing, the following additional remarks from the Undersigned are also submitted in support of traversal of the rejection and patentability of Applicant's claims.

More particularly, beyond Applicant's feature/limitations utilizing test programs within a wafer prober, and automatically changing a test program from the first test program to the second test program in the prober, added Independent Claim 14 performs such testing and automatic changing on a lot-by-lot basis for differing (first and second) wafer sets (*i.e.*, lots) contained within a same cassette.

Added Claims 10 and 15 supplement the automatic changing of programs, by automatically changing test parameters from the first test parameters to the second test parameters. Similarly, added Claims 11 and 16 supplement the automatic changing of programs, by automatically changing the prober jig configuration from the first prober jig configuration to the second prober jig configuration. Claims 12, 13, 17 and 18 supplement, by including a third electrical test and program, and by automatically changing a test program to the third test program from a prior test program to facilitate the third electrical test. Anderson (US 5,834,838 A) fails to anticipate any of such features/limitations of Applicant's combination Claims 10-18.

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art would not support a §102 anticipation-type rejection of Applicant's claims.

TAIRA *et al.*, SN 10/670,352
Amdt. dated 05/02/2004
Reply to OA mailed 02/01/2005

Dkt. 501.41197CX1/310100259US2
Page 10

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such §102 rejection, and express written allowance of all of the rejected claims, are respectfully requested.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer of any scope or subject matter. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, *i.e.*, Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the local D.C. area number 703-312-6600, to discuss an Examiner's Amendment or other suggested action for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

TAIRA et al., SN 10/670,352
Amdt. dated 05/02/2004
Reply to OA mailed 02/01/2005

Dkt. 501.41197CX1/310100259US2
Page 11

This Amendment is being filed within the shortened statutory period for response set by the 1 February 2005 Office Action (1 May 2005 being a Sunday), and therefore, no Petition or extension fee is required. To whatever other extent is actually necessary, Applicant respectfully petitions the Commissioner for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. Further, no additional claims fees are required for entry of this paper. Please charge any actual required fee to ATS&K Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (as Case No. 501.37459X00).

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Skwierawski
Registration No. 32,173
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 North Seventeenth Street, Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209-3873, USA
Telephone 703-312-6600
Facsimile 703-312-6666